



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/661,530 06/11/96 LUDWIG

VCDR-001/12U
EXAMINER

B3M1/0602
COOLEY GODWARD CASTRO HUDDLESON & TATUM
FIVE PALO ALTO SQUARE
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
PALO ALTO CA 94306

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
DINH, D 5

2317
DATE MAILED:

06/02/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 20 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 2 - 20 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Pursuant to MPEP 606.01, the title has been changed to read:
--SYNCHRONIZATION IN VIDEO CONFERENCING--.

Claim 11 is depend upon itself. It is assumed to be a dependent of claim 10 for the purpose of the rejection below.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-15, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Etherphone system as disclosed by Rangan "Software Architecture for Integration of Video Services in the Etherphone System" and further in view of Maeno "Distributed Desktop Conferencing System (MERMAID) Based on Group Communication Architecture".

As per claims 2-3, Rangan teaches a teleconferencing system essentially as claimed, comprising:

- a) an av path [p. 1396 fig.1];

- b) an AV conference manager for managing video conferencing [p.1397];
- c) a least one of the group consisting of:
 - i) multimedia mail system [p.1402 col.1 last paragraph];
 - ii) a multimedia conference recorder [p.1401 "Video File Server"];
- d) means for synchronize and recording video image and spoken audio and data during conference [apparent from p.1402 col.1].

Rangan does not specifically disclose a data conference manager for managing data conference. Maeno disclose a teleconferencing integrating data and video conferencing. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a data conference manager with Rangan's system because it would enable participants to view and process multimedia documents simultaneously with voice + video conferencing [Maeno p.0522 col.1 first paragraph].

As per claim 4, Rangan teaches message marker [p.1042 1st paragraph - "annotations"].

As per claim 7, Rangan teaches conference capture tools and annotation tools [p.1396 col.1 lines 39-45 "Tiogavision"].

As per claim 8, Rangan teaches synchronizing and recording and multimedia document storage such that the multimedia document can be retrieve by a participant [p.1402 col.1].

As per claim 9, it is apparent that information can be transfer between the mail system, synchronizing and recording and the document storage.

As per claim 10, Rangan teaches relative timing [p.1402 col.1 2nd paragraph "bar of length proportion to the duration of the video" "cursor tracking current position on the bar"].

As per claim 11, Rangan teaches selectively halt and continue the message [apparent form p.1402 col.1 2nd paragraph "any part can be selected and played back"].

As per claims 13-15, and 18-20, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 1-4, and 7-11 above.

Claims 5-6, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Etherphone system as disclosed by Rangan and Maeno further in view of Rosenbaum US patent 5,404,435.

As per claims 5-6, and 16-17, Rangan does not teach tag searcher for searching defined tag in multimedia mail message. Rosenbaum teaches a multimedia document system with searchable tags to enable retrieval of the whole or portion of the multimedia document. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Rosenbaum with Rangan and thereby arrives at the claimed invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Etherphone system as disclosed by Rangan further in view of Milne et al. US patent 5,553,222.

As per claim 12, Rangan teach a teleconference system essentially as claimed. Rangan does not disclose detail of the synchronizing method. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look for synchronization teaching.

Milne teaches method for synchronizing multimedia events using system clock and SMPTE clock from AV signal [col.7 lines 50-64]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of Milne with Rangan because it would have provide the system with effective synchronization of multimedia events [col.1 lines 53-55]. Milne teaches using the AV timer (SMPTE) to control reproduction [col.7 lines 55-60]. Since images do not have timing source, one of ordinary skill in the art would have know to use a data display timer [system timer] to control the reproduction when only images are displayed [col.7 lines 50-53].

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Serial Number: 08/661,530
Art Unit: 2317

-6-

Nakayama et al. US patent 5,363,507 teaches method and system for storing and retrieving collaboration information from teleconference sessions.

Drake et al. US patent 5,550,966 teaches method for capture and playback of AV presentation.

Doll et al. US patent 5,351,276 teaches retrieving audio using control from digital network.

Nolan et al. US patent 5,253,362 and Morgan et al. US patent 5,239,466 teaches methods for annotating document.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached at (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5359.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



Dung Dinh
Patent Examiner
May 23, 1997